DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 676 FL 001 301

The Sixth Annual Report of the United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs; Is Anyone Listening?

State Univ. System of Florida, Tallahassee.
Report No-H-Doc-91-66-GPO
Pub Date 21 Jan 69
Note-36p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.90
Descriptors-Administrative Agencies, Agency Role, *Annual Reports, *Cultural Activities, Cultural Exchange, Evaluation Needs, Exchange Programs, Federal Government, *Federal Programs, Financial Needs, Foreign Relations, Government Role, Intercultural Programs, *International Education, *International Programs, Library Programs, Personnel Needs, Program Effectiveness, Program Evaluation, Program Proposals

After an introductory commentary in which recommendations for and evaluations of the government's handling of international educational and cultural affairs are offered, this report indicates a need for continuity of personnel in both the Advisory Commission and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. A proposal is made to establish a separate agency to coordinate all government-sponsored international educational and cultural programs, and suggestions for needed reorganization are outlined. Remarks about the long-range damage done to overseas operations by the revelations concerning the Central Intelligence Agency's involvement in foreign educational activities are made. A discussion of funding problems includes the establishment of a need for grants to pursue evaluation studies. Comprising the final section are the suggestions offered by the Government Advisory Committee on International Book and Library Programs. (AF)

ED028676

91st Congress, 1st Session - - - - - House Document No. 91–66

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

LETTER

FROM

THE CHAIRMAN, THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

TRANSMITTING

THE SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 87–256

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FL 001301

JANUARY 27, 1969.—Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

98–011 O WASHINGTON : 1969

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with section 107 of Public Law 87–256, I submit herewith the Sixth Annual Report of the Advisory Commission.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH R. SMILEY, *Chairman.*

3

IS ANYONE LISTENING?

THE

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Washington, D.C.

January 21, 1969

THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

JOSEPH R. SMILEY, Chairman
President, University of Colorado

HOMER D. BABBIDGE, JR., Vice Chairman
President, University of Connecticut

WALTER ADAMS
Professor of Economics
Michigan State University

WAYLAND P. MOODY
President, San Antonio College

ARNOLD M. PICKER
Chairman, Executive Committee
United Artists Corporation

THOMAS E. ROBINSON
Chairman, Department of Secondary Education
Rider College

ABRAM L. SACHAR
Chancellor, Brandeis University

ROBERT A. SCALAPINO
Professor of Political Science
University of California, Berkeley

MISS PAULINE TOMPKINS
President, Cedar Crest College

James A. Donovan, jr., Staff Director
Washington, D.C. 20520

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT
of the U. S. Advisory Commission
on International Educational and Cultural Affairs

INTRODUCTION

Foreign and domestic policies are inextricably interwoven; indeed, it is difficult to tell in many cases which is the warp and which the woof in the fabric of our society. Of one thing, however, we can be certain. Each influences the other. In short, we have problems at home and overseas. This nation must engage in its problem solving -- in part because we still have a "decent respect to the opinions of mankind." Our information and educational exchange programs are a manifestation of this continuing respect.

In this, our Sixth Annual Report to Congress, we cannot dwell on the domestic problems of riots and racism, ghettoes and transit systems, education and urbanization. But we must recognize at the outset that the solutions to these problems will make ever-increasing demands on the public purse and hence may have a profound effect on international programs.

There are no quiet places in the world today. The nation must not deceive itself into thinking that even when a peaceful and honorable settlement is achieved in Viet-Nam, we shall be free of foreign entanglements, and our frustrations with foreign affairs at an end. Still we must not let these frustrations turn our attention from our real and permanent responsibilities as we respond with our manifold international programs. In particular, this Commission's main concern is that there must be no further eroding of programs of international educational and cultural exchange as a result of the general feelings of frustration with things international. We assume that after 30 years of Government-supported educational and cultural relations, this nation is committed to such programs. If it is not, it should be.

In any case, the faith of this Commission remains steadfast in the Government's educational and cultural exchange programs as one way of letting other nations witness our problem-solving and one significant opportunity for cooperation with other peoples. And so it should. There has recently been called to our attention a series of letters from 105 ambassadors and chargés d'affaires around the world. An analysis of these letters shows that it is the overwhelming consensus of these U.S. mission heads that the educational and cultural programs -

(1) Are an effective and significant element in our long-term foreign relations with virtually every country replying. (The force and conviction of the statements, many of them from veteran ambassadors, are striking.)

(2) Are an effective and essential tool to reach and inform national intellectual and political leaders, and the press and other information media on American character and policies.

(3) Have effectively contributed to removing misconceptions about, and hostility to, the United States and its social, economic, and cultural achievements; and, as a corollary, to offsetting pro-Communist propaganda and predilections.

(4) Have significantly helped to develop education and to introduce new educational approaches in many countries, with particular reference to the developing nations.

(5) Provide an invaluable means for keeping channels of communication open in both directions at times when and places where political tensions or hostility block official diplomatic relationships.

(6) Are a significant method of reaching young people -- especially potential leaders in the emerging countries and the "new generation" which has come up in Europe and elsewhere with little recollection of World War II and few postwar associations with the United States.

Specific examples of effectiveness cited in the letters are many and persuasive, namely:

(1) In most countries with long-standing exchange programs, an impressive number of key people today at very high levels -- in political and public life, in press and information circles, and in education -- are former grantees.

(2) In emerging countries the programs have been markedly successful in selecting leaders and potential leaders.

(3) Strong, fruitful, and continuing relationships have been established, through the exchange programs, with educational institutions, educational policymakers, professors, and teachers.

(4) The exchange programs have been a successful means of introducing American studies abroad, especially in Europe, and of acquainting teachers with the United States and its educational system.

This is not to say that these programs are perfect or that the ambassadors had no criticism of them. On the other hand, it is difficult indeed to state precisely what an ideal educational exchange program would be, just as it is impossible for an educator to state what the ideal curriculum in any subject is.

Since the law which created this Commission requires us to report to Congress annually, we have assumed that Congress wishes our views and our recommendations in regard to the program. Further, it should be remembered that in Executive Order 11034 (June 25, 1962) implementing the Fulbright-Hays Act and delegating authority under it to various Government departments and agencies, the President reserved unto himself the right to receive recommendations from the Commission. We intend, therefore, to transmit to the President a copy of this annual report to the Congress.

We recommend:

(1) That the President personally and vigorously identify to the American people and to Congress the crucial importance of international educational and cultural programs and that he give continuous support to such programs as a vital part of U.S. foreign relations and an indispensable sector of the infrastructure of U.S. foreign policy.

(2) That the President establish an organizational structure within the executive branch which will assure consistent and purposeful national action in international educational and cultural affairs.

Some questions which would be answered in the implementation of these recommendations are listed below:

What administrative pattern, both in Washington and in the field, can best facilitate the Government's performance of its role? Should all educational and cultural activities supported by Government be directed by one agency, or should they be dispersed among various agencies; and if the latter, how can they be effectively coordinated? And how should the administration of educational and cultural activities be related to that of similar activities such as economic development assistance or trade?

To what extent should the international cultural programs of the United States be deliberately related to those of other countries, and should this be done primarily through multilateral means or through bilateral, reciprocal means? For that matter, to what extent <u>can</u> cultural relations be made genuinely reciprocal?

What should be the magnitude of an adequate educational and cultural relations program, and what should be the relative magnitude of each of its component parts?

These questions, and many others like them, have been the subjects of discussions in innumerable studies, reports, conference sessions, and congressional hearings, as a conscious search for overall policy has developed and become increasingly insistent.

Underlying all these questions, and in a sense conditioning the answers to all of them, is the fundamental question: How can educational and cultural programs contribute to the advancement of the basic objectives of U.S. foreign policy?

If the recommendations and the questions listed above seem familiar, so they should. The recommendations are taken almost verbatim from a report of 1961 to the new Kennedy administration and to the Congress by our predecessor commission, the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. It was written by Walter H. C. Laves. 1/ These questions, which persist as fundamental and valid, are taken from the book Cultural Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy, by Charles A. Thomson and Walter H. C. Laves (Indiana University Press, 1963).

It seems to us that, as a nation, through our representatives in Congress and through innumerable educational institutions, volunteer groups, cultural societies, world affairs councils, and the like, we must reaffirm our commitment to international educational and cultural exchange. If we choose not to, let us say so. If we are committed, let us begin to move forward.

CONTINUITY OF PERSONNEL AND THE ROLE OF THE CULTURAL AFFAIRS OFFICER

"Continuity of personnel is essential for both the Advisory Commission and CU /Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State/ to carry out their responsibilities. Frequent changes in the Assistant Secretary of State's office and in foreign service personnel assigned to CU for 2 to 3 years, points

---

1/ Twenty-sixth Semiannual Report on Educational Exchange Activities. House doc. no. 199, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961).

98-011(H.D. 68) O - 69 - 2

to the importance of a number of permanently based civil servants throughout CU. Has a careful study been made of the need to include young people as civil servants in CU to have them acquire the knowledge and experience so essential in planning educational and cultural programs?" 2/

It seems to us high time that the study called for in the question above should be made. Indeed, it appears to us that Congress in passing the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (P.L. 87-256, usually known as the Fulbright-Hays Act) clearly had a career service in mind for Civil Service employees in the Department when it authorized 10 supergrade positions for such persons. We see little evidence, however, that the Department of State has done anything to promote a career service of this sort within the Department.

For the record we would like to quote part of the Herter Committee report 3/ which seems to us to be even more significant and important now than it was in 1962 when it was written:

"For example, in a study conducted this year, only 1.2 percent of Foreign Service Officers indicated primary preference for four functional specialties involving work primarily or exclusively in Washington (public affairs, cultural affairs, international organization affairs, and intelligence and research). Most prefer to remain in the mainstream of the Foreign Service, which they consider affords better promotion opportunities.

"...It may be noted that the bulk of the positions in administration are filled by civil servants; the Department has not had the same difficulty in staffing

---

2/ "Research, Appraisals and Reports." Report for the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (Department of State), by Mabel Smythe and Walter Johnson, September 1964 (mimeographed).

3/ Personnel for the New Diplomacy, Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs Personnel (Washington, D.C., 1962).

administrative posts as it has in the other functional fields referred to above."

We hasten to add another more recent quotation. This one is at the time of writing scarcely a month old. It comes from a report prepared for the American Foreign Service Association. The report concerns itself with the personnel of the Foreign Service, of the Department of State, and of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) inter alia. After remarking that they were not entirely sure of what course of action to recommend to the new incoming President and Secretary of State, the writers then go on as follows:

"We were certain of several things. The first was that there is a need in several areas of the Department for a degree of continuity that would be difficult to obtain by staffing from the Foreign Service without seriously distorting the competitive promotion system on which a healthy Foreign Service must depend. The Bureau of Intelligence and Research seemed a case in point. Certainly an infusion of Foreign Service Officers can provide a balance and additional perspective which is highly useful; yet the need for the continuous application of the expertise of our Civil Service colleagues has been invaluable in providing an institutional memory, as well as intimate and detailed knowledge of the other agencies in the intelligence community. The same conclusion would be applicable to the Bureau of Economic Affairs, to the Bureau of Public Affairs, to the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, to the Bureau of /Educational and/ Cultural Affairs, to the Legal Advisor's Office and certainly to the range of support services which are vital, without which the Department simply could not operate, and which most of us tend to take for granted.

"We were also certain that the Department of State had attracted over the years an extraordinarily able, talented and dedicated group of civil servants who had made an enormous contribution to the conduct of the foreign affairs of this nation. We were equally certain that any personnel arrangements which did not accord scrupulously fair treatment to this group would not be in the national interest." 4/

4/ Toward a Modern Diplomacy, A Report to the American Foreign Service Association (Washington, D.C., 1968), p. 43.

So, there we have, it seems to us, both seasoned and recent statements of a problem to which not nearly enough time and effort has been devoted by the Department of State or by USIA. We strongly urge that this problem get prompt and serious attention and that some means be worked out whereby young persons coming into the Department or into USIA could be trained for assignments in educational and cultural affairs work in Washington. Many of the persons now in high positions in both CU and USIA are persons who came into Government 25 or 30 years ago during World War II. Various retirement incentive plans are making it more attractive for these persons to leave, but the loss in continuity, knowledge, and even wisdom, is more than programs in international educational and cultural affairs can afford. Needed are officers who are not only experienced in administering programs but who are also passionate advocates of the basic idea of educational exchange. One simply cannot get such advocates and specialists with personnel rotating in and out of Washington, or in and out of USIA foreign service posts. We have reason to believe, for example, that many cultural affairs officers (CAO's) are thoroughly frustrated in their desire to have a career leading upwards in cultural and educational affairs overseas. However, the bulk of the Information Agency work is necessarily and properly concerned with information and propaganda, and the persons at the top, it appears, are always going to be specialists in these fields.

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other."

The CAO cannot but feel a divided loyalty, since his promotion and career depend on the USIA, which employs him, whereas in his daily work on educational exchanges he is responsible to the Department of State.

There <u>are</u> such divided loyalties, and we see no way of ending these except by the creation of a separate agency to concern itself primarily with educational and cultural programs, as we recommended last year in our Fifth Annual Report, and herewith recommend again below.

A NEW AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

We were interested to read the 23d Annual Report of our sister commission, the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information. It was a good report. What impressed us most was the recommendation that all educational, cultural, and informational programs be thrown together, possibly in a new and independent agency. The amount of space devoted in the report to USIA's educational and cultural programs is likewise impressive. Equally significant -- and seemingly contradictory -- is the relatively small amount of funds devoted to such purposes by USIA. So we must continue the dialog with that Commission regarding our conviction that programs of information and propaganda on the one hand and those of educational and cultural affairs on the other must be separated, to the organizational and budgetary benefit of both.

We repeat our recommendation of last year that somehow all the international educational and cultural programs of this Government be pulled together in one separate agency. This would mean that English language teaching, the binational centers, and the information centers and libraries of USIA might be combined with the programs of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State. All of these would be put into one new Agency for International Education. We see no reason why ultimately the Peace Corps, the educational programs in the Office of International Training of the Agency for International Development (AID), and perhaps some of the activities of the new Institute for International Studies (IIS) in HEW could not also be incorporated into this one agency.

We recognize that some of these "international education" programs face inward (for example, many of those in the new IIS of HEW) and concern themselves with the internationalizing of domestic education -- elementary, secondary, and higher -- and require the attention of educators. Other programs -- those of AID, the Peace Corps, and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs -- look outward and vitally affect our relations with the rest of the world. These must continue to get

broad policy guidance from the Department of State. But to have all the domestic-oriented and foreign policy-oriented programs in one agency strikes us as opening a possibility for a coordinated approach to international education in all its aspects, which simply has not previously existed. America's role in the world requires some such approach if we are to carry out our responsibilities to ourselves for the rest of the 20th century and even beyond. We remind our readers that students graduating from college in 1968 will be in their fifties in 2001; that pupils entering school in 1969 will spend most of their working lives in the 21st century. We must prepare them for a world rapidly becoming so small, so much the "global village," that almost all problems take on international coloration and require international cooperation for their solution.

To sort out the overseas information and propaganda programs of USIA from its cultural and educational programs is not so difficult, in our view, as it may appear at first blush. Ever since the passage of the Smith-Mundt Act (P.L. 80-402) in 1948, there has been a futile, unproductive, and endless argument going on as to where education and culture end and information and propaganda begin. The Forum Series of the Voice of America, for example, is every bit as cultural, as well as educational, as one could ask such a program to be. Likewise, much of the programming of the Motion Picture and Television Service and the Press and Publications Service of the U.S. Information Agency has a high educational content and should continue to do so, for the simple reason that USIA has the facilities for a mass media approach. We are not, then, proposing or suggesting that the Agency do nothing but propagandize for the U.S. Government's foreign policy.

We do, however, suggest that those parts of the 23d Annual Report of the Advisory Commission on Information under the heading "New Duties" and "New Emphases" point out quite clearly some of the new directions in which the Information Agency should go. The Agency should indeed, we agree, develop further its professional capacity for publicizing abroad the U.S. Government's activities and its policies and statements dealing with

foreign affairs, including educational and cultural activities as well as those of AID and the Peace Corps. (It already publicizes overseas the activities of the latter two agencies.) It should, further, bring to bear its expertise in public relations on the formulation of foreign policy. The public affairs officers should certainly make greater contact with foreign journalists and other communicators overseas just as the Agency should with foreign journalists in the United States.

We are pleased to note that the Commission on Information considers cultural and educational exchanges to be one of the mainstays of USIA's operations overseas. But the truth is that these are now Department of State programs which, under current administrative arrangements, the Agency runs for the Department with funds transferred annually to the Agency from appropriations made to the Department under a differentiation set up by Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953 of President Eisenhower.

The other commission recognizes the administrative complications inherent in such an arrangement, as everyone has since the USIA was created in 1953. However, there are many persons in the Department of State and in the Congress who believe -- for other than administrative reasons -- that educational and cultural exchange programs should be as widely separated as possible from programs dealing with information and propaganda. Again, we suggest there are some lessons to be learned here from the British Council and the Canada Council, from the British Information Service, and the World-wide Broadcasting Service of the B.B.C.

Educational and cultural exchange programs of the Department of State should not be confused with those programs of USIS overseas which publicize and explain U.S. policies. So we disagree with those who say that to create credibility for informational programs should be a main function of educational and cultural exchanges. Such credibility should be a by-product of those exchange programs, which should be planned, funded, and operated for genuinely educational or cultural purposes. Only thus can they benefit this country most.

What this suggests in turn, it seems to us, is that the informational programs of USIA should be transferred directly into the Department of State. It appears to us that the Secretary of State would wish to have at his immediate disposal -- and not in a separate agency in Washington -- those public relations experts whose chief if not sole job is to explain American foreign policy abroad. By the same token each ambassador would wish, we believe, to have as a part of his regular Foreign Service staff, similar public relations experts. The role of the British Information Service comes to mind at once in this regard.

Others are now presenting the view that all of USIA should be returned to the Department of State, e.g.:

"After the information function was withdrawn from the Department in accord with the desire of Secretary Dulles for the Department to concentrate on 'policy' and divest itself of 'operations,' the feasibility of this action was kept under continuing review by President Eisenhower's Commission on the Reorganization of the Government, whose membership included Nelson Rockefeller, Arthur Flemming, Milton Eisenhower and Don K. Price. They finally concluded that the nation's interest would be best served by returning USIA to the framework of the Department of State and so recommended to the President. However, time was too short for this to be accomplished in the remaining period of the Eisenhower Administration.

"We believe that recommendation to have been a wise one. We believe the new President should use his reorganization powers to place USIA within the Department as an autonomous unit, as is AID now, and that the Director of USIA should rank as an Under Secretary of State as the Administrator of AID now does. We noted that the Arms Control and Disarmanent Agency and the Peace Corps were already situated within the framework of the Department." 5/

5/ Toward a Modern Diplomacy, A Report to the American Foreign Service Association (Washington, D.C., 1968), p. 23.

Be that as it may, we repeat that educational and cultural exchanges should be separated from information and propaganda wherever located. It is obvious, in any case, that the new administration must come to grips with the problem of the proper location in the Government of educational and cultural exchanges. This problem has been with us since the creation of USIA as a separate agency in 1953. And, in short, the intermingling of propaganda with educational exchanges has weakened the effectiveness of both.

Finally, the new Agency for International Education, which we here propose, should include certain segments of the Department of State which concern themselves with the educational and cultural programs of such multilateral organizations as UNESCO, OAS, and OECD. The plans and authorization for this new agency should also provide for receipt of private funds such as are now enjoyed by the Smithsonian Institution and the Library of Congress.

One last thought occurs to us in regard to the locale of educational and cultural exchanges in Government. We wish to state with all possible emphasis that, whatever is done with the educational and cultural programs now in the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, they must not be broken up. It has been suggested by some, for example, that the American Specialists Program and the Cultural Presentations Program might well be housed in the United States Information Agency. Others have proposed that the academic exchange programs be placed in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. So to split up these programs would, in our view, be disastrous. They now serve and should continue to serve one unified purpose, namely, that of displaying American educational and cultural achievements to the world, whether this be done through cultural presentations, through study by a teenager at an American high school, by advanced research in this country or overseas, or by a genuinely educational program of one month for a distinguished visitor from abroad. All these seek to educate in the best and broadest sense of the word and, incidentally, to leave the recipient of the grant or the participant in the cultural event with a truer picture of the United States.

98-011(H. D. 66) O - 69 - 3

THE CIA AND THE "RUSK COMMITTEE"

Readers will remember that our last annual report concerned itself to a considerable extent with what we considered to be the almost irreparable and surely long-range damage done to educational and cultural programs overseas by the revelations that the Central Intelligence Agency had been engaged in covert activities overseas which could have been carried out overtly under the authority of the Fulbright-Hays Act. Further, we said such revelations made suspect practically every scholar, student, professor, or teacher going overseas under U.S. Government auspices, and many under private programs.

We were puzzled by the fact that no one thought to seek our advice during that Spring of 1967 when the revelations about the CIA were filling the papers daily and at the time when the Katzenbach panel and later the Rusk Committee were established. We have the impression that there were those who thought we were exaggerating the possible effects of these disclosures. Indeed, the inaction and apparent dissension within the Rusk Committee lead us to believe that some high-level officers in the Government still do not look upon this problem with the proper concern. Our belief is reinforced by the fact that no report of final decisions by the Rusk Committee has been forthcoming.

That our fears were well-founded is evidenced by a report that appeared in the Washington Post (and in the New York Times) on August 16, 1968. The Post story was headlined "India Suspects U.S. Scholars." It was necessary for a professor from the University of California to call the Ministry of External Affairs in New Delhi to give assurances, the Times said, that he was not an operative of the Central Intelligence Agency. It turns out, according to the newspaper story, that much of his research being done in the Himalayas was, however, paid for by the Defense Department. Thus, we have here an example of one of the uses of the universities which corresponds very well indeed to the situation described in our special report of last year

by Walter Adams and a colleague, Adrian Jaffe, concerning the universities' crisis in identity.6/ The crisis arises from the fact that many universities take on chores for any Government agency regardless of whether or not the task assumed fits the main purpose of the university.

In any case, in India the continuing suspicion of CIA or Defense Department infiltration into the world of scholarship resulted in delays for visas for many Americans simply seeking the truth in their own fields in a foreign country.

As we go to press, an article in the New York Times of January 12, 1969, cites the continued concern of certain Indian intellectuals with "academic colonialism," and with the domination of Indian universities and intellectual life by American institutions. (See Seminar, The Monthly Symposium (New Delhi, India), December 1968.) Whether one agrees with these touchy Indians or not, what they believe is important.

Events then, have proved that we were not alarmists—that our educational and cultural programs are suffering as a result of these disclosures. And yet little has been done except to withdraw financial support by the CIA and to rescue some of the so-called "CIA orphans," substituting some of the ever-decreasing monies appropriated to the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Our greatest regret is that the Government did not see fit to overhaul the whole structure of educational, cultural, and information programs at that time when the receptivity of the public to such a reorganization was at its peak.

6/ Government, the Universities, and International Affairs: A Crisis in Identity. House Doc. no. 120, 90th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

What all this illustrates again, it seems to us, is that the operation of these educational and cultural programs belongs in an agency whose first task it is, and not in one for which it is secondary or even tertiary.

We recognize that the State Department must be concerned with many matters other than operating a large educational program. But it is hoped that, if these programs are to remain in the Department of State and not be put in a new agency, a new administration will appoint an Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs who will remain on the job for at least 4 years and will be positive and persuasive with the Congress as regards funds, and will devote his undivided attention to the operation of the program.

FUNDING

The Fulbright-Hays Act (PL 87-256, sec. 107), as noted, requires that this Commission make an annual report to the Congress and "make reports to the public in the U.S. and abroad to develop a better understanding of and support for the programs authorized by this Act." We have assumed that when the Congress asks us to write an annual report, it also wants us to make recommendations. Our recommendations to the Congress concerned with funding have not been heeded.

For example, we carried out the mandate of Congress in PL 87-256 to make a special study of the effectiveness of the Department of State's educational exchange programs and published this study as our First Annual Report in 1963. We need not repeat here the overwhelming evidence published in that report[7/] that the program has been by and large tremendously successful and is an important and

---

7/ A Beacon of Hope, A Report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963).

significant element of American foreign relations. Throughout the studies on which we based the report and running through the interviews with knowledgeable persons, whether written or oral, the theme of "fiscal starvation" recurs.

We spoke in our Fifth Annual Report, 4 years later, of the humorless irony in the fact that, as the programs improved -- the Department of State having taken a good deal of our advice -- and as their effectiveness increased, as more and more top-level ambassadors and others realized the value of educational and cultural relations, and, finally, as the President himself turned his attention to "international education," the level of available funds continued to decrease. The appropriated State Department budget for educational and cultural exchange programs for the present fiscal year (1968-69) is $31 million. This represents a decline from $56 million available for the programs as of the date of our first report (1963) and from $43.7 million in appropriated funds for last year (fiscal year 1968). (We have noted with satisfaction that the Board of Foreign Scholarships has called attention to these severe reductions in its 6th annual report to Congress.) Dismay and consternation at this last cut in the budget by nearly 28 percent are mild words for the deep emotions and genuine frustration we feel because of our ineffectiveness in convincing the Congress of the importance of these educational and cultural programs.

While we do not believe that it is the function of this Commission to get into administrative details such as allocation of funds cut-by-cut or country-by-country, once Congress appropriates the money, nevertheless we share with many members of the academic community, and others, grave reservations when we note the 67 percent cut in the number of American grantees going overseas. This cut appears to have been made on the false premise that somehow the Fulbright-Hays programs and the sending of American scholars, professors, teachers, students, and specialists overseas under it contribute to the serious balance-of-payments problem facing the United States. We believe that such considerations should never have entered into the cuts in the budget

or the allocation of funds under it. The President states specifically in his State of the Union message that restriction on overseas travel of students and teachers was not to be "unduly penalizing." 8/ The Secretary of the Treasury also indicated that such persons were to be exempt from these restrictions. 9/ Next, the President in a memorandum of January 18, 1968, directing cuts in "U.S. employees' and official travel overseas" said to the Secretary of State and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, "You should make these reductions in a way which maintains the effectiveness of our international programs." 10/ Further, it is interesting to note that ultimately no travel restrictions (other than moral suasion) on the U.S. citizen, nor any travel tax eventuated from all the deliberation. Thus, the Department of State's budget for educational and cultural exchange became almost the sole loser in this game.

8/ Congressional Record, January 17, 1968, p. 11101: "We must try to reduce the travel deficit we have of more than $2 billion and we are hoping that we can reduce it by $500 million -- without unduly penalizing the travel of students, teachers ...."

9/ Statement by Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler, before the House Committee on Ways and Means on certain legislative aspects of the President's balance of payments program, February 5, 1968 (excerpts):

> "Exemptions from the tax would be limited to the following:
>
> 1. Individuals and their families, transferred or going abroad in connection with their trade, business profession, or education, and remaining abroad for more than 120 days.

(see next page)

Moreover, the reason cited for cutting the budget of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs -- that hundreds of millions were being spent by other agencies for "exchanges" -- fails to take cognizance of the fact that the so-called exchange programs of other agencies such as the U.S. Public Health Service or the Army do not fulfill the same purposes as do those of the Department of State under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act.

One more particular cause for worry in the severe cuts into the Fulbright-Hays program budget has to do with the blow to the concept of binationalism which has characterized the academic exchange programs since 1946. That many governments have so believed in the program that they have entered into cost-sharing agreements with this Government in order to keep the program going as our supply of foreign currencies decreases is evidence of a faith in educational exchanges which we must not betray by

---

"Nevertheless, some of those who commented on our original proposal indicated that even a modest tax would force cancellation of some desirable trips, especially those made by students and others on very strict budgets. As revised, our proposal would avoid this possibility in that a student or other traveler could completely avoid the expenditure tax by keeping his average daily expenditures below $15.00. This level of daily expenditures would seem completely realistic, especially for the type of trips taken by students and others traveling on modest budgets." Later on he said "The available statistics show that in income groups below $20,000 the total expenditures per trip are relatively the same, but the less affluent spend less per day and stay longer. This latter group is heavily weighted with students, teachers, and individuals visiting foreign relatives ...."

10/ Department of State Newsletter, no. 81 (January 1968).

eliminating even some of them unilaterally. It is imperative that the budget for educational exchange programs be increased as rapidly as possible under the new administration. The sums involved -- $31 million to $56 million in range over the past several years -- strike us as being almost paltry considering some of the sums expended for some other purposes and considering further the lasting benefits resulting from the "mutual understanding" which the Fulbright-Hays Act calls for.

Further, this Commission has always been concerned about any decline in educational exchanges in Western Europe -- so much so, in fact, that in 1964 we sent to the Congress a Report on the Strategic Importance of Western Europe 11/ prepared by Commission member Walter Adams. We repeated in subsequent annual reports our concern about these exchanges. It is particularly distressing, then, to find that the program in Western Europe has been cut for the current fiscal year so badly that only 56 grants for short-term international visitors have been allocated to Western Europe, whereas there were 234 such grants in fiscal year 1968.

We are likewise concerned that after the drastic cuts made in the American Specialists Program, which as presently budgeted will receive less than half of the money spent in fiscal year 1968 and less than one-third that spent in fiscal year 1967, there will not be more than 75 specialist grants all together. Of these not more than four or five can be sent to Western Europe. The total budget for American Specialists to that part of the world is now estimated at $13,700!

Grants for short-term visitors in the total world program are down from 2,393 to 1,182. In short, the funds are down by 39.7 percent, and the number of grants down by 44 percent, according to present allocation of funds. This Commission's interest in

---

11/ House doc. no. 367, 88th Cong., 2d sess. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964).

the short-term international visitor program is a lasting one, as readers of Open Hearts Open Minds 12/ will remember. Readers of our quarterly publication Exchange, which in the Fall 1968 issue carried a history of 20 years of the "leader-specialist" program, will also remember our interest in this subject as well as our concern that such grants, although short-term, be arranged in such a way that they are genuinely educational and have lasting results -- as indeed most of them do. Again, we express our worry about suggestions that these short-term visitor programs might be separated from the academic programs. Both are dependent to a great extent upon the bottomless reservoir of good will on the part of thousands of persons on the campus and in the community, and we feel strongly that programing would suffer if they were separated.

We are informed that the cultural presentations program has also been cut so drastically that it is becoming increasingly difficult even to provide a token American cultural presence in many countries of the world. To be sure, the artistic quality of the program has remained high, but the necessarily smaller groups and individual artists sometimes lack the impact of large companies and well-known institutions. For example, because of the limitation on the Department of State's funds, while Britain's Royal Ballet and the Soviet Union's Bolshoi Ballet were touring the United States, no American group of comparable size and reputation was able to perform abroad.

A sizable and important part of this program, that for sending athletes and athletic coaches abroad for performances, consultations, the holding of clinics, and the like, has also been badly curtailed. The reports

---

12/ Third Special Report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. House doc. no. 386, 89th Cong., 2d sess. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966).

on the impact of many of these eager young athletes touring various parts of the world are most impressive. These athletes present quite a different picture of American youth from that which one might gain from reading the front pages of the daily newspapers. Interest in sports is worldwide and the success of American Olympic teams, which demonstrates our athletic prowess, should not be the only manifestation of our understanding of the role of international athletics as one form of cultural exchanges. Sending American coaches to train athletes of other countries is, for example, we believe, one of the most generous forms of cultural exchanges in which this country engages.

As for the academic programs, it appears that many of the worst cuts will be made in funds for research scholars, professors, and lecturers in the fields of American studies and the teaching of English as a foreign language. This is particularly anomalous in the latter case since the President approved 3 years ago a policy statement directing all Government agencies having English language teaching programs to increase them to the extent possible. English is, after all, the main medium through which we must transmit our culture and our ideals. The more we can encourage the learning of English the easier our tasks will become.

Our interest in American studies dates back to the First Annual Report of the Commission at which time we foresaw a special report on American studies abroad, 13/ which was written by the then Commission member Walter Johnson. We believe that the recommendations made in it were sound and are still valid. We regret especially, therefore, to see that some of the programs for producing a deep understanding of America may be lost for want of funds.

13/ A Special Report on American Studies Abroad. House doc. no. 138, 88th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963).

Further, we call to the Congress' attention, as we consider it as important as the funding of international educational and cultural programs, the current lack of funding of the International Education Act of 1966. It appears to us that the purposes of this act were little understood by the Congress, perhaps because it confused these purposes with those of international educational exchange or with those of the Agency for International Development. In truth, the goal of the International Education Act was to internationalize education within the United States. It was designed to strengthen research into international problems, to strengthen international programs at smaller and developing colleges, and generally to provide a continuing flow into American society of persons well-informed in international affairs and the world about them.

As Professor Karl W. Deutsch of Harvard University has said, the continuation of present developments in international education "will soon significantly reduce and partly dismantle the knowledge and intellectual capabilities of the United States and the effective intellectual resources available to its people and leaders for coping with the problems of our intellectual environment. Within a very few years, this will amount to a partial one-sided disarmament of the United States in the arena of world problems." 14/

Thus it appears that both the Departments of State and HEW suffer from confusion concerning both programs. So we raise our voice again for an increase in funds both for international educational programs at home and for international exchanges between this and other countries. The United States has been a leader over the past year or two in declaring 1970 to be International Education Year. How odd that that year will be preceded by one in which our expenditures for educational exchanges are the lowest of any time in recent history!

14/ Newsletter, American Council of Learned Societies, April 1968.

Lastly, we call to the Congress' attention again, in connection with the funding of Government programs for educational and cultural affairs, our report on The Use of U.S.-Owned Excess Foreign Currencies, 15/ which has recently been sent to the Congress. We believe that this report contains a number of proposals and suggestions which can ultimately provide for considerably larger expenditures of foreign currencies and also thereby result in larger educational and cultural exchanges.

EVALUATION STUDIES

In 1964 this Commission recommended to the Department of State in the strongest terms possible that it give continuous attention to "research, appraisals and reports" by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. At about that time the Evaluation Staff of the Bureau was abolished, and no money has been forthcoming since for regular evaluation of the programs by a permanent staff, and little for outside studies except for the very few undertaken by the Commission itself. We look on such studies as one of our main functions, but there can be no substitute for a permanent staff of trained and schooled evaluators. It seems to us that any budget presentation to the Congress must be backed up by solid and objective studies and reports by the staff showing clearly the results of the programs in detail, as we have cited these in general at the beginning of this report on the basis of subjective statements by ambassadors and chargés d'affaires.

CONCLUSIONS

In short:

1. We reaffirm our belief that the educational and cultural exchange programs of the Government have

---

15/ The Use of U.S.-Owned Excess Foreign Currencies, a special report to the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, by Byron W. Brown, January 1969.

been and continue to be a success by any measurement.

2. We assert that these programs and their place in the Government deserve Presidential attention as one of the most important aspects of our foreign relations.

3. It follows, then, that we feel the programs should be properly funded in terms of the foreign policy-oriented purposes which underlie them. By this we mean that the Congress should provide each year sufficient money to maintain and improve such on-going programs as the teaching of English as a second language and American studies overseas as an integral part of a comprehensive cultural and educational relations program. We would leave to the judgment of the operators the exact amount to be requested each year, but surely the amounts must not fluctuate over the decades as they have in the past. These fluctuations, it seems to us, show the lack of a firm belief in Government-sponsored international educational and cultural programs which is simply unbecoming a great nation.

4. We repeat our recommendation that the International Education Act be funded as soon as possible and to the extent feasible. Congress has authorized appropriations. It is time they were made. The funding of this act will provide an educated and informed generation which the country cannot afford to be without.

5. We intend to continue the dialog with our sister commission, the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, so that we may discuss in greater detail the subjects that have already been broached in the meetings that we have had.

6. We call upon the President and Secretary of State to seek the Advisory Commission's advice to a greater extent than previously. We feel that we are knowledgeable about many of the problems in this field.

7. We feel that there must be a permanent evaluation staff for these programs so that the Department will know of successes achieved or problems encountered year in and year out and can thus constantly improve the programs.

8. We feel especially strongly that after 30 years of Government-sponsored educational and cultural programs overseas it is time that the Government and the nation, too, decide in what agency these programs are to be located, how and to what extent they are to be supported, and how their relationship to domestic international educational and cultural programs, to information and propaganda, and to intelligence gathering are to be ordered in the whole complex of Government agencies.

APPENDIX

GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL BOOK AND LIBRARY PROGRAMS

For the past several years the Commission has included, either in its annual report or as an appendix, statements by or about the Government Advisory Committee on International Book and Library Programs.

This year we include recommendations prepared by the Committee for the new Secretary of State, Mr. William P. Rogers, in response to a request made by Secretary Rusk when he met with the Committee on January 8, 1969.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL BOOK AND LIBRARY PROGRAMS

The three major goals of the National Policy Statement on International Book and Library Activities* issued in January 1967 are fully as important and essential today as they were two years ago. These goals are:

1) To give full and vigorous support to a coordinated effort of public and private organizations which will make more available to the developing countries those book and library resources of the United States which these countries need and desire;

2) To encourage and support the establishment of viable book publishing and distributing facilities in the developing countries and regions of the world;

3) To promote actively the free flow of books and other forms of recorded knowledge among all peoples of the world.

The principal recommendation of the Government Advisory Committee on International Book and Library Programs to the new administration is that these goals be reaffirmed as major policy objectives of the United States Government.

The Committee realizes that the task of filling the world's need for books and of achieving an adequate exchange of books among nations is enormous and that no single institution or organization and no single government can hope to accomplish it alone. Real progress can be achieved only through a coordinated effort of Government agencies, private institutions, and international organizations. The Committee,

---

* Reprinted in Appendix 2 of the Commission's Fifth Annual Report, p.40.

therefore, urges that all Government agencies concerned in any way with international book and library programs be instructed to assign a higher priority to these programs and to coordinate their activities in this area with each other and with the private sector more effectively than they have done in the past.

The specific objectives outlined in the implementing directive to Government agencies issued simultaneously with the National Policy Statement on International Book and Library Activities are, in the Committee's view, still valid and should also be reaffirmed. A number of these objectives should be given special attention at this time and the Committee urges that this be done. A list of these objectives, with the Committee's recommendations for action, follows:

1. From a long-range point of view, the only way in which the book needs of the world can be satisfactorily met is through the development of viable indigenous book publishing and distributing facilities. The United States can best assist in this endeavor by providing funds and technical assistance to qualified nationals. One of the best vehicles for doing this is Franklin Book Programs, a private, non-profit organization established in 1952 for the purpose of assisting international book publishing development. Franklin has the potential to accomplish a great deal in this area through its unique ability to call upon and apply the skills of the private sector. Not only has it been welcomed by developing countries in South America, Africa, and the Near East and South Asia; it has been used as a model by developed countries. In the Committee's opinion, the Government -- or more specifically the U. S. Information Agency and the Agency for International Development -- has never taken full advantage of Franklin's potential.

2. The importance of exchange and training programs to the development of greater professional competence in all aspects of publishing cannot be

overemphasized. More specifically, past exchanges of publishers' delegations, particularly with Eastern European countries, have had valuable and long-lasting effects. The Committee would like to see such exchanges increased, not only with Eastern Europe but also with countries in the developing world which already have fairly well-developed publishing industries, for example, in South America. Further, the Committee believes that publisher exchanges with selected developed countries should be undertaken with a view to coordinating the aid of these countries to developing areas.

3. The Committee believes that support for programs of library development in the developing countries is of the utmost importance and should be given a high priority. These programs should be undertaken in cooperation with American libraries and library organizations and the American publishing industry.

4. One of the key means for expediting the free flow of ideas throughout the world is the library. The American libraries maintained overseas by the U. S. Information Agency have played a vital role in making available to other peoples information about the full spectrum of America's life and culture. When the U.S.I.A. closed many of its libraries in Western Europe several years ago, the Committee was greatly disturbed and registered a strong protest. While the Committee firmly believes in the value of having American libraries overseas, some of the members doubt the wisdom of having these libraries operated by what they regard as essentially a propaganda agency. An ad hoc panel of the Committee is currently examining all aspects of American library policy overseas and expects to submit to our April 1969 meeting its recommendations on the kind of library presence the United States should have abroad and the proper role of the Government in the operation of overseas libraries. The Committee urges that the new administration examine very carefully the panel's recommendations.

5. With the passage of legislation in 1967 enabling the United States to adhere to the Florence and Beirut Agreements, the goal of eliminating tariff barriers to the free flow of books and related educational materials was virtually achieved. However, the free flow of books is still seriously restricted in many countries by other barriers, notably by the lack of internationally acceptable currencies. American books are desperately wanted and needed in many countries which simply do not have the dollar exchange necessary to buy them. The Committee strongly recommends that one of the first priorities of the new administration be the passage of legislation to establish a program for guaranteeing currency convertibility on sales of books overseas.

Another serious obstacle to the free flow of books across national boundaries is the delay caused by outmoded, time-consuming import procedures. Publishers today can deliver an order of books from the United States to almost any other country in the world within a matter of days, but more often than not that order must wait weeks and often months before it can be delivered from the port of entry to the local distributor. The Committee proposes to name an ad hoc panel to recommend solutions to this problem.

6. The directive instructs Government agencies to provide greater support to the efforts of the U. S. book industry toward the attainment of the goals of the policy statement. Generally speaking, the book industry has found Government agencies helpful and cooperative. However, there is one instance of a recent Government action which has had the effect of seriously hampering the American publishing industry in its efforts to sell American books overseas. This was the promulgation in January 1968 of the Foreign Direct Investment regulations which have had the unintended effect of actually restricting book exports. The Committee urges the new administration to look very

closely into this problem with a view to finding some means for exempting books from these regulations.

The most significant action taken by the Government thus far to implement the National Book and Library Policy Statement was the establishment of special inter-agency task forces to develop regional book and library policies for the United States in each of the four major areas of the developing world -- Latin America, East Asia and the Pacific, the Near East and South Asia, and Africa. The task forces for Latin America and for East Asia and the Pacific presented their recommendations -- arrived at in consultation with Committee-appointed panels of experts in the publishing and library fields -- in January 1968. The Committee fully endorsed these recommendations but little if any action has thus far been taken. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommends that the new administration act upon them immediately.

The Committee would also like to commend to the attention of the new administration the recommendations for an overseas textbook policy prepared by a Committee-appointed panel of experts and endorsed by the full Committee in July 1968.

Finally, the Committee would like to record its unqualified support for the objectives of the International Education Act, which was passed by the Congress in October 1966 but has yet to be funded. The Committee realizes that the International Education Act is directed primarily toward internationalizing education in the United States. It believes, however, that the creation of new generations of Americans educated to understand international issues and problems is related in a very direct way to the problems of international book and library development which are its specific concern. The authorization for the Act was extended by the 90th Congress for three more years -- to 1971. The Committee strongly urges the new administration to give its fullest support to obtaining the appropriations necessary to implement this Act.

1/16/69